

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1-6 are amended by way of the present Amendment. Claims 8-20 have been newly added by way of the present Amendment.

In the Office Action: Figures 1-3 were objected to by the Draftsman. Claims 1-3, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Tsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,532,712). Claims 4 and 5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being otherwise allowable.

In response to the objection to the drawings, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. The Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review indicates that the drawings reviewed were filed on July 25, 2001. However, on September 12, 2001 Figures 1-3 were re-filed in clean form. The Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings submitted on September 12, 2001 do comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.152.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Tsuda et al., the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claim 1 recites a DC-DC converter, an interface unit, a memory, a data processor, a scan processor, and a timing control unit provided inside a chip.

Tsuda et al. relates to a drive circuit for use with transmissive scattered liquid crystal display device. In Figure 8 and the accompanying description in column 6-7, device 3 is disclosed as a drive IC. In Figure 10 and the accompanying description in column 8, an insulated DC-DC converter 11 is disclosed.

However, insulated DC-DC converter 11 is not a part of device 3. This is evident and apparent upon inspection of Figure 9 which illustrates drive ICs Q1 to Q22. Each of drive ICs Q1 to Q22 receive voltage VDD 1, which is the output of insulated DC-DC converter 11. It is disclosed in column 8, lines 64-65 that "...insulated DC-DC converter 11 outputs a +5 VDC signal V_{DD1} for generating a logic signal." Accordingly, if voltage VDD 1 is input into drive ICs Q1 to Q22, each of which is illustrated in more detail in Figure 8 as device 3, then insulated DC-DC converter 11 cannot be inside the same chip as an interface unit, a memory, a data processor, a scan processor, and a timing control unit. Accordingly, unlike the recitations of claims 1-3 and 6, there is no disclosure in Tsuda et al. of a DC-DC converter, interface unit, a memory, a data processor, a scan processor, and a timing control unit provided inside the same chip. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Tsuda et al., the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claim 7 recites "...generating an impedance value corresponding to

[a] voltage control signal...” On page 4 of the Office Action, it is implied that Figure 10 discloses “...generating impedance value corresponding to the voltage control signal...” However, upon inspection of Figure 10, there is no disclosure of generating an impedance value corresponding to a voltage control signal. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established in this rejection.

The Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Lesperance and Examiner Hjerpe for the objections to claims 4 and 5, indicating that the subject matter of claims 4 and 5 is allowable. The Applicant also recognizes the “examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance” on pages 4-6 of the Office Action. However, for the purposes of prosecution history estoppel, the Applicant is unable to acknowledge this statement as it does not correspond to the recitations of the claims word-for-word.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Daniel H. Sherr at the telephone number listed below.

Appl. No. 09/911,851
Amdt. dated September 11, 2003
Response to Office Action of March 12, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-152

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Daniel H. Sherr
Registration No. 46,425

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/DHS:tjw
Date: September 11, 2003

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610